

"NORTH AMERICAN" DOCUMENTS.

LETTERS FROM GEO. LAW, EPHRAIM MARSH, & CHAUNCEY SHAFFER

LETTER FROM

THE HON. EPHRAIM MARSH.

PRESIDENT OF THE CONVENTION WHICH NOMINATED FILLMORE AND DONELSON.

SCHOOLEY'S MOUNTAIN, N. J., Sept. 10, 1856.

MESSRS. JOHN H. LYON, JOSEPH W. ALLEN, L. OTT,
E. H. GRANDIN, J. R. CORNELL, JOHN R. WEEKS:

GENTLEMEN:—Having been constrained by the course of public events, occurring since the meeting of the American National Convention, by which the Hon. Millard Fillmore was nominated for President of the United States, over which convention I had the honor to preside, to renounce that nomination, you, as my colleagues in that Convention, are entitled to my reasons for so doing, and I will proceed briefly but frankly to state them.

It was known to my friends at Philadelphia that the pro-slavery platform there adopted, and which drove so many Northern delegates from the Convention, was repugnant to my sentiments and sympathies. But, confiding in the principles of Mr. Fillmore, who, in the Legislature of New York, and in Congress, had ever acted with the friends of freedom, I acquiesced in an exceptionable platform. In view of the perfidious repeal of the Missouri compromise, and the aggressions and outrages perpetrated by Missourians upon Kansas, with more than the approval of the general government, I looked for some expression of the sentiments which pervaded the whole North—sentiments that Mr. Fillmore had ever professed, in his letter of acceptance. But in this expectation I was disappointed. There was a studied and significant avoidance in that letter, of the question upon which he knew, as we all know, the Presidential election is to be decided either in favor of, or against, slavery extension. Nor was I less disappointed in finding the friends of Mr. Fillmore in Congress, voting steadily, throughout a protracted session with the supporters of aggression and outrage in Kansas, and persisting in such votes, after, by the report of the Kansas Congressional Committee, it had been irrefragably proven that the elections in Kansas had been carried by armed bodies of men from Missouri; that an infamous code of Territorial laws had been enacted in Kansas by Missourians; that free presses in Kansas had been destroyed by Missourians; that

settlers in Kansas had been robbed and murdered by Missourians; that organized and armed bodies of men from Missouri and other Slave States had sworn in secret societies that Kansas shall become a Slave State; and, finally, that all these outrages were perpetrated with the aid and approbation of a United States Judge and Marshal, and in the presence of United States troops. But these great wrongs, though arousing the just indignation of freemen, have elicited no word or reproof from Mr. Fillmore. On the contrary, in his speech at Albany, he astonished the country in declaring that the election of Col. Fremont, by the spontaneous suffrages of a majority of the citizens of Republic, would occasion a dissolution of the Union. And up to the last vote in the called session of Congress, when the friends of freedom endeavored, in the Army Appropriation Bill, to protect the citizens of Kansas by the adoption of a conservative proviso, Hon. Mr. Raven, the confidential partner of and partisan of Mr. Fillmore, voted with the pro-slavery majority. Indeed, since the commencement of the just-closed session of Congress, slavery has not obtained an advantage that it did not owe to the votes of Mr. Fillmore's friends: nor has freedom encountered a defeat that did not come from the same quarter of the House of Representatives. His friends, holding the balance of power, turned the scale, when it would turn, in favor of slavery.

And where, or in what respect, has Mr. Fillmore profited, politically, by all these sacrifices of principle?—all these violations of duty—all these surrenders of independence—all this self-abasement? What has been gained by bartering freedom for slavery?

His nomination, as you know, was demanded by our Southern brethren, who would only consent, even to his nomination, upon terms that drove most of the Northern delegates out of the Convention. It was painfully apparent in the deliberations of our Convention that Americanism was but a secondary object. Slavery was with them the paramount consideration. While, for the sake of the broad American principles that had taken deep hold of the public mind, we were prepared

to ignore the slavery question, they insisted on making it, and did make it, the primary article of faith in our platform.

And how, after imposing terms which have shorn the American party of its Northern strength, do the South Americans act? Have they kept or broken faith with us? In North Carolina, whose election is just over, the American party is virtually disbanded. The Hon. Mr. Puryear, an American member of Congress from that State, concedes the State to Mr. Buchanan, though, aside from slavery, there is an acknowledged political majority against him.

In Kentucky, where was one year ago a triumphant American majority, our party is beaten, if not annihilated. Col. Humphrey Marshall, a gallant leader, seems to have nailed his colors to the mast; but that only proves that he is "faithful among the faithless."

The Hon. Mr. Walker, of Alabama, a member of our Convention, who was among the most zealous advocates of Mr. Fillmore's nomination, has, from his seat in Congress, proclaimed his abandonment of Mr. Fillmore and his adhesion to Mr. Buchanan. Senator Jones, of Tennessee, with Senators Pratt and Pearce, of Maryland, life-long opponents of the democratic party, have proclaimed themselves in favor of Mr. Buchanan, and now stand along with Senators Cass, Douglas, Atchison, &c., upon the Cincinnati platform. There has been, within the last three months, and since the issue, which is to give freedom to, or force slavery into Kansas, was made up, a regular political stampede from the Southern whig and American parties over to the support of Mr. Buchanan.

Now what, let me inquire, does all this mean? Mr. Fillmore, as you well know, was the nominee of the Southern States. Those delegates were not only for him, but would take none else. Why, then, do they abandon him? Simply because they, having but one interest in politics, and watchfully consulting the political barometer, are guided by its suggestions. They calculate the chances and the cost of a Presidential election. The platform upon which they placed Mr. Fillmore offended Northern sentiment. The action in Congress, and the events in Kansas have awakened throughout the North and West an indignation so deep and pervading, as to deprive Mr. Fillmore of the votes of every Free State. To qualify himself for acceptance in Slave States, Mr. Fillmore had to take grounds which necessarily repelled the Free States; and having thus lost the North, the South, for that reason, abandons him. In this the South acts understandingly, and is true to herself. Mr. Fillmore became valueless to slavery the moment it was certain he could not subsidize the North. And although abandoned by those who nominated him, neither Mr. Fillmore nor his friends can justly charge the South with bad faith, for the terms of the compact were distinctly understood. They aimed, with Americanism as a cover, to extend slavery. He was to bring Northern strength. Unable from the stringency of the terms imposed, and the enormity of the outrages perpetrated in Kansas to do that, the consideration failed, and the South declares for Buchanan

instead of Fillmore, as the most available candidate. If, therefore, the South, as it has done whenever a "Northern man with Southern principles" ceases to be useful, lets Mr. Fillmore "slide," he must console himself, as did Cardinal Wolsey, with the reflection that, if he "had served freedom with half the zeal he has given to slavery, he would not now be left naked to his enemies." Nor is this poetic truth only, for while serving freedom, no man was more honored and prospered than Millard Fillmore; rising, as he did, from station to station, higher and higher, in the State and National governments, and enjoying, until tempted by ambition to abandon his principles and party, universal regard and confidence.

Shall we, of the North, then be required to adhere to a nomination which has been deliberately abandoned by the South? Shall we cling to Mr. Fillmore after those most earnest in his nomination are supporting Mr. Buchanan?

This is the practical question. Let us, therefore, look it practically in the face:—

Even in the present state of the canvass, all but one or two of the Southern States are not only sure to vote for Mr. Buchanan, but are made sure by the votes of Southern Americans, who were pledged to Mr. Fillmore. As the canvass progresses, and Northern sentiment develops and concentrates in favor of Col. Fremont, the remaining one or two Southern States will declare unmistakably for Mr. Buchanan, on whom the whole South will be united.

On the other hand, the Free States, with the exception of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, have or in the progress of the canvass will, declare for Fremont. The nominee of the American party, abandoned by the South, though espousing its principles, and repudiated by the North because of his subserving to the South, is driven into New Jersey and Pennsylvania, two States upon which his friends hang a "forlorn hope." But does Mr. Fillmore, or any sane man, suppose or pretend that he can carry either of these States? Assuredly not.

It is certain, however, and it is conceded, that a union of the Americans and Republicans in both States, would take them from Buchanan and carry them where they belong, into brotherhood and fraternity with freedom.

May I not, then, rely upon the patriotism of my American friends, appeal to them with confidence in favor of union here in my own State, and in our sister State of Pennsylvania, for the sake of that glorious Union which we all love and cherish as an inheritance more precious than any other gift, though encumbered, as portions of it necessarily were, with slavery? Does any one tell me in reply, that our American principles forbid this union? Of such let me inquire what has been done, or sought to be done, by Southern Americans in Congress, to carry out our principles? Have they passed, or attempted to pass any laws upon the American question? Or have their voices and their votes been given constantly in favor of slavery extension? In refusing to unite with other friends of free Kansas (the only issue involved in the contest), Americans in New Jersey and Pennsylvania are with their eyes open to

the inevitable result, aiding Mr. Buchanan, whose national and State platforms contain open denunciation of the American party, to carry these States. Yes, nothing is more certain than that New Jersey and Pennsylvania can elect or defeat Mr. Buchanan. The responsibility either way rests with the Americans. We can beat or be beaten by the party that is avowedly hostile to freedom and to Americanism. We cannot elect Mr. Fillmore, and for one, after the course pursued in Congress by his immediate representatives, after his own disloyal declarations in favor of a dissolution of the Union in the event of Col. Fremont's election, I am free to say I do not desire his success.

I have heard but two tangible reasons urged against Col. Fremont. The first is, that he is a sectional candidate. This is neither his fault nor the fault of those who support him. The repeal of the Missouri compromise was a national question and a national wrong.

The extension of slavery beyond its constitutional boundary is a national question. If, as in the repeal of that compromise, national compacts were violated, may not the people seek national redress? In what way, or by what means, can that wrong be righted but in a constitutional manner, through the ballot boxes? The freedom of Kansas and Nebraska was violated by the action of the Executive and Legislative departments of the government. May we not, without incurring the reproach of sectionalism, endeavor to re-establish freedom in those Territories by reforming the Executive and Legislative departments.

Who set up the cry of sectionalism when General Jackson, from Tennessee, and Mr. Calhoun, from South Carolina, were President and Vice President? Why, Mr. Fillmore himself, who now counsels a dissolution of the Union if Fremont and Dayton should be elected, supported sectional candidates for President and Vice President in 1828 and 1834. The idea of dissolving the Union for such a cause is, I am happy to see, denounced by enlightened and patriotic Southern men.

General Houston, the distinguished Senator from Texas, in his closing speech in the Senate, said:—"They tell me if Fremont is elected forty thousand bayonets will bristle about the Capitol—that the South, in fact, will secede. Mr. President, I scorn the suggestion. There will be neither bristling bayonets nor secession, if Col. Fremont shall be elected by a majority of the people. Though I am not his supporter, I shall respect the majority of the people; and to Col. Fremont, as the chief magistrate of their choice, I shall pay my respectful homage." The Hon. Henry Winter Davis, a talented and eloquent American member of Congress from Maryland, holds the following sentiments, which are much more becoming an American than those uttered by Mr. Fillmore at Albany:—

There are men who go about the country declaiming about the inevitable consequences of the election of Fremont: and the question is asked, whether that simple fact is not sufficient, not merely to justify but to require a dissolution of the Union? The question has been asked me to-day. That is a question which I do not regard as even a subject of discussion. It never will be done while men have their reason. It never will be done until some party, bent upon

acquiring party power, shall again, and again, and again exasperate beyond the reach of reason the Northern and Southern minds, as my Southern friends have now exasperated the Northern mind. It would be an act of suicide, and sane men do not commit suicide. The act itself is insanity. It will be done, if ever, in a tempest of fury and madness which cannot stop to reason. Dissolution means death, the suicide of Liberty, without a hope of resurrection—death without the glories of immortality; with no sister to mourn her fall, none to wrap her decently in her winding sheet, and bear her tenderly to a sepulchre—dead Liberty, left to all the horror of corruption, a loathsome thing with a stake through the body, which men shun, cast out naked on the highway of nations, where the tyrants of the earth who feared her living, will mock her dead, passing by on the other side, wagging their heads and thrusting their tongues in their cheeks at her saying, "Behold her, how she that was fair among nations, is fallen! is fallen!" and only the few wise men who loved her out of every nation will shed tears over her desolation as they pass, and cast handfuls of earth on her body to quiet her manes, while we her children stumble about her ruined habitations, to find dishonorable graves wherein to hide our shame. Dissolution? How shall it be? who shall make it? Do men dream of Lot and Abraham parting, one to the east and the other west, peacefully, because their servants strive? That States will divide from States, and boundary lines will be marked by compass and chain? Sir, that will be a portentous commission that shall settle that partition, for canna will be planted at the corners and grinning skeletons be finger posts to point the way. It will be no line gently marked on the bosom of the republic, some meandering vein whence generations of her children have drawn their nourishment, but a sharp and jagged chasm, rending the heart of great Commonwealths, lacerated and smeared with fraternal blood. On the night when the stars of her constellation shall fall from heaven, the blackness of darkness forever will settle on the liberties of mankind in this Western world.

The other objections to Mr. Fremont addresses itself particularly to Americans. It is alleged that he is a Roman Catholic. The force of this objection depends upon its truth or falsity. It is a simple question of fact. The charge originated in the New York *Express*, and rested upon the declaration of Alderman Fulmer, who says that when at Brown's Hotel, in Washington, in the winter of 1853, he saw Col. Fremont worshipping in a Catholic Church; that he conversed with the Colonel on the subject of religion, and that he defended the extreme doctrines of the Romish Church. By reference to the columns of the same *Express*, it is shown that Col. Fremont was, during the whole of the time Alderman Fulmer locates him at Washington, on board of ocean steamers. An examination of the register and cash books of Brown's Hotel, show that Col. Fremont was not, during the years of 1852 and '53, at that hotel. Here is conclusive, independent evidence that Alderman Fulmer is mistaken. This testimony is confirmed by Col. Fremont's denial of the whole story. The archives of the Episcopal Church at Washington show that Col. Fremont's children had Protestant baptism. Mr. Livingston, who was Col. Fremont's companion across the Rocky Mountains, says that he carried with him a pocket Protestant Bible. He presented his wife with a Protestant prayer-book before their marriage.

His preceptor says that he received a Protestant education. Col. Fremont says to everybody that inquires of him, that he is and ever has been a Protestant. And yet, not only in the absence of all testimony, but after every allegation has been disproved, those who fabricated continue to reiterate the falsehood, and I am sorry to add, that too many intelligent, honest electors, who would

require better evidence to convict a dog caught with the wool in his mouth, of killing sheep, believe that Colonel Fremont is a Papist.

It was said, you will remember, by many of our friends at Philadelphia, that Mr. Fillmore's name would be used at the South merely to divide the friends of freedom at the North. I did not believe it then, nor do I know that such was their design; but that Mr. Fillmore's name is now only used for that purpose, is transparently certain. Nor should this surprise us, for it is just what the past has often revealed.

Mr. Van Buren, who, for thirty years was devoted to the South, hesitated about the admission of Texas, and was thrown overboard.

General Pierce, literally used up in promoting the repeal of the Missouri compromise, and in sustaining border ruffianism, was remorselessly sacrificed at Cincinnati by the South for "an older, if not a better" doughface, whom they hope to elect. Differ as they may and do, in relation to all other questions, on this every extreme of shade and sentiment and opinion unite. They regard the bank—the tariff—the public domain, &c., &c., subordinate questions, and differ upon them; but in voting upon the annexation of Texas—the admission of California free—the fugitive Slave Law—the repeal of the Missouri compromise, &c., &c.,

they always unite; or if a Southern member gives a wrong vote, like Cullum of Tennessee, and Hunt of Louisiana, they are shot down. Why, then, should they not, as they have, make their Americanism subservient to their slavery? If, therefore, Mr. Buchanan should be elected, I see no end to the encroachments and usurpations of the slave power—and hence I shall neither vote for him nor throw my vote away. In a contest which is to determine whether slavery or freedom is to be the governing principle of this republic, I choose to cast my vote where it will tell for freedom. These considerations lead me to the support of the republican nominees for president and vice president, not because I am less an American than when our National Convention assembled, but because those by whom Mr. Fillmore was nominated, from Southern States, have abandoned him for a candidate openly and avowedly arrayed against the American party, thus sacrificing for slavery both their candidate and their Americanism; and because, furthermore, by voting for Mr. Fillmore, while the contest is between Buchanan and Fremont, I should indirectly aid the former, whose principles, as an anti-American and slavery extensionist, are obnoxious to all my convictions of duty. Respectfully yours,

EPHRAIM MARSH.

LETTER FROM

GEORGE LAW TO GEN. GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS SCROGGS.

NEW YORK, July 20, 1856.

TO JAMES GORDON BENNETT, Esq.,

Editor of the Herald:

In your journal of the 22d inst., there appeared a letter addressed to me, signed G. A. Scroggs, and dated Buffalo. He says that his letter ends "all further discussion of this subject," on his part. I do not choose that it shall end it on mine; I shall address my reply to yourself.

Mr. Scroggs complains that my letter to him on a previous occasion was published in the newspapers. This I do not think strange of, as the facts stated in that letter, in relation to Mr. Fillmore, the candidate of Mr. Scroggs, cannot be very flattering to those who intend to support him. I can easily pardon Mr. Scroggs for the feeling he evinces in his letter. It was evidently a piecemeal contribution by the clique that have Mr. Fillmore in charge, so that, in fact, Mr. Scroggs had nothing more to do with it than to sign his name, under a promise that he was to be their candidate for Governor of this State. I understand the workings of the little Fillmore circle, as there are leaky spirits in every conspiracy that is got up from motives of selfishness. Gustavus Adolphus seems afraid that I shall publish a confidential letter he wrote me. He need be under no alarm. His genuine letter is safe in my hands. I will not expose its bad grammar and barren ideas, even to establish by its publication, that the recent letter which you published was not his production; and

as Mr. Fillmore had evidently reviewed it, and assisted in making it up, I reply to it, through your journal, as coming from Mr. Fillmore.

In reference to the denial of Mr. Fillmore that he was subordinate to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, while acting President, let me now state a few facts to refresh his memory. Mr. Fillmore owed his elevation to the Presidency to the fact that he was tacked on as Vice-President and run in on the popularity of General Taylor. No sooner had he arrived at Washington, after his election as Vice-President, than he commenced his official career of faithlessness to all his friends who had assisted in his elevation, making contradictory promises and pledges of support to different applicants for office, until he became involved to such an extent in contradictions that he had to leave Washington, and run off to the country, to get rid of meeting, face to face, those that he had pledged himself to support for the same office. As soon as he returned to the Capital he commenced intriguing against General Taylor, the President, secretly charging that honest and patriotic man with being the cause of all these numerous disappointments, and endeavoring to make political capital for himself by defaming General Taylor. This was the cause of Mr. Fillmore losing all influence or position with the President, for he saw that he was unworthy of his confidence. While the compromise measures were under discussion, he pursued the same vacillating course pretending with the friends of these meas-

nres that he was with them, and with the opponents of these measures that he was upon their side. He did not possess the manliness to assume an open position of responsibility with either. Immediately after the death of General Taylor, when the Presidential chair was assumed by Mr. Fillmore, he called Mr. Webster to his Cabinet, as Secretary of State. Mr. Webster hesitated for some time about accepting office under Mr. Fillmore, and did not do so until solicited by his friends, and then only after Mr. Fillmore had solemnly assured him that he would not allow his name to be put forward for the Presidential nominations of 1852; but no sooner had Mr. Fillmore got his Cabinet arranged and Mr. Webster fastened in the position of Secretary of State, than he began, as usual, intriguing for himself—paving the way by appointments to office, and the grossest sycophancy to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, in order to supersede Mr. Webster as the candidate for 1852. This is the secret of his falling into the arms of the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, and his entire subservieney to that section; and by this abject submission to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South he hoped, and did succeed in his hopes of getting the support of the Southern delegation over Mr. Webster in the Baltimore Whig Convention. This was the scheme by which he expected to elevate himself over the distinguished Webster, and make himself the Southern candidate.

The record of the voting in the Baltimore Convention shows how well he succeeded, and how it was carried out by the Southern delegates. It was this act of treachery on the part of Mr. Fillmore and the delegates from the South voting for him, that broke the heart of the great Statesman of the East; for soon after the convention, he went to Marshfield, where he remained until his death; and it is well known with what bitterness he regretted that he had ever allowed himself to be in the Cabinet of Millard Fillmore. At the Baltimore Convention of 1852, the Southern delegates supported Mr. Fillmore, but a great portion of the Northern delegates were prevented from supporting Mr. Webster for the reason that he was a member of Mr. Fillmore's Cabinet, and his administration had become obnoxious because of its subservieney to the 350,000 slave-owners' power, and Mr. Webster, whether blameless or not, had to share his portion of the odium.

Mr. Fillmore began his subservieney and made up his Cabinet by a bargain with the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, placing the War, and Navy Department in the hands of Secretaries from their section. The 350,000 slave-owners of the South required it, as also that the Secretary of the Interior, whose business was with the Territories, should be a Southern man. This was the bargain. Mr. Fillmore should be the last person to prate about sectional parties. He did more than any other man, while President, to divide the country into two great sectional parties.

Mr. Fillmore, while acting President, never represented the party that elected him, nor the principles that he was nominated and elected upon, or that he had professed prior to his election. He proved faithless to the party that elected him—

faithless to his own professed political principles prior to his election. He betrayed all for the selfish purpose of accomplishing a renomination and a re-election. For this selfish purpose he made his administration sectional and subservient to the 350,000 slave-owners. He divided his party upon that issue, and destroyed it by seeking Southern support. His appointments were all directed to that end. I will give you instances: In the spring of 1852, Hon. John McKinley, Judge of the United States Supreme Court for the States of Alabama and Louisiana, died. The President, after nominating Wm. C. Micon, Esq., of New Orleans, as his successor, and receiving that gentleman's refusal to serve, nominated Edward A. Bradford, Esq., of the same city. Both these gentlemen were partners of the present Louisiana Senator, Hon. Judah P. Benjamin. The nomination was laid on the table, and a committee waited on Mr. Fillmore to say that he had better withdraw the name. Mr. Fillmore inquired why; was he not of proper age? Yes, he was a man of gray hairs. Was he not an eminent lawyer? Yes; and it was conceded as advisable that Louisiana's civil law should be represented in the Circuit and Supreme Courts. What, then, was the objection?

Mr. Bradford was a New-England man, and understood to be unsound on the question of the constitutional right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories—holding similar views with Judge Story. Upon this intimation Mr. Fillmore withdrew the name, and substituted the name of George E. Badger, the Senator of North Carolina, a most bitter foe to freedom, and who glories in the institution of slavery, the same as Mr. Donelson, the nominee for Vice-President with Mr. Fillmore. Mr. Badger lived one thousand miles out of the circuit wherein the vacancy happened. Mr. Fillmore went out of his way to get a pro-slavery candidate! But the Senate were compelled by the voice of the New Orleans and Mobile bar to reject the interloper.

I will give another instance, and could add hundreds, if it were worth while to do so. A Southern gentleman, a member of the House of Representatives, took a sudden and unexpected part for Mr. Fillmore. He made a speech on the floor of the House in his favor, and supported him for a nomination. He was appointed by Mr. Fillmore to a valuable pecuniary mission to a distant country. He could not have reached his destination before Mr. Fillmore's administration was brought to a close. This was the result of a direct bargain, and was a sample of the manner in which Mr. Fillmore used his patronage and power to secure a nomination from the delegates of the 350,000 slave-owners. But he played his game too far, and the result was, that although he obtained the support of the delegates of the 350,000 slave-owners, yet he disgusted the delegates from the free States; they went for General Scott, and he was nominated.

Now compare this course with the policy of the present administration, which Mr. Scroggs so much condemns, and see the extraordinary similarity between the two. Mr. Pierce commenced precisely the same thing, by intriguing for a renomination as soon as he got into power, and he

too, was jealous of his Secretary of State, the same as Mr. Fillmore was of Mr. Webster.

Mr. Pierce gave the appointments of the army and navy to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, by selecting extreme Southern men for the heads of these departments, thus putting all the military and naval power of the general government into the hands of the extreme men of the South, the same as Mr. Fillmore did.

Mr. Pierce has used the patronage of his office, while President, to secure a re-nomination from the Democratic Party, the same as Mr. Fillmore did, while he was President, to secure a re-nomination from the Whig Party.

Mr. Pierce signed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and pushed slavery into Kansas, Nebraska, and all that region secured to freedom by solemn compact, under the same motives, to secure the support of the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, that Mr. Fillmore signed the Fugitive Slave Law, which deprives a man of his freedom, without the right of a trial by jury.

Mr. Pierce received the support of the delegates of the 350,000 slave-owners of the South at the Cincinnati Convention in 1856, as Mr. Fillmore obtained the same southern support from the Baltimore Convention in 1852.

Mr. Pierce has divided and destroyed the Democratic party that elected him, the same as Mr. Fillmore divided and destroyed the Whig party that elected him, viz.: by a weak and vacillating foreign policy—by his abject subserviency to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, and by his intrigues for a re-nomination.

Mr. Buchanan has placed himself upon the 350,000 slave-owners' Southern platform of Gen. Pierce; and the circle that surrounds Mr. Fillmore and endeavor to push him upon the country, stand him on the same Southern platform, and are actuated by the same selfish motives and subserviency to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South that actuate the circle which surrounds Mr. Buchanan. How far the political friends of either can deceive the freemen of the North and South in their professions, remains to be seen in the coming canvass. My own candid opinion is, that it is the destiny of Millard Fillmore to destroy the American party, the same as he destroyed the Whig Party by attempting to prostitute it to the sectional purpose of the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, and this is precisely what the extreme men of the South want, viz.:—to divide and destroy every party in the Free States, and unite themselves at the South, in order that the 350,000 slave-owners' power may govern and control the nation, and push the institution of slavery, which degrades labor to a level with the beasts, over this entire country; for there is no party at the South, Whig, Democrat, or American, but must yield abject submission to the 350,000 slave-owners' power, for slavery, which was acknowledged by the framers of the constitution, both North and South, to be a great evil, is now upheld and supported by their 350,000 slave-holding descendants in the South as a blessing. The institution is justified, and no man at the South dare say otherwise. If he exercise the rights of a freeman, and speaks his feelings on the subject, he is driven

from his State, and not even allowed to return for his family, as is evinced of Mr. Underhill, of Virginia, who was driven from that State for no other reason, than that he chose to exercise the right of a freeman, and attended a convention in the Free States.

Is this a free government, in which the liberty of the citizen is thus abridged, or in which the right of thought and speech is denied? Is this the freedom that our fathers established, or that we believe in and enjoy at the present day?

I would ask whether sectionalism exists at the South or in the North? Is freedom sectional, or is slavery sectional? Was our government created to uphold freedom or slavery? When did freedom ever drive from her homes citizens for exercising a freeman's right?

Tyranny in every form has always been afraid of discussion, and seeks to silence, exile, and crush those who oppose it. Freedom, on the other hand, seeks to encourage it. Upon these great issues Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Buchanan stand upon slavery. Mr. Fremont is for freedom.

Which one is the sectional candidate? Which one is the best representative of what our government was intended to be, for the civilization of the present day? It is not Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore. They are sectional candidates, for they are both peculiarly the candidates that are pledged to the interest of the extreme slave South alone. They are the sectional candidates of the 350,000 slave owners of the South, and neither represents the great interests of the twenty-five millions of freemen of the North and South.

Mr. Scroggs, in his letter, alludes to Mr. Fillmore's statesmanship while acting President. I will refresh you with one remarkable instance in which it was exhibited. When the reciprocity treaty presented by the British government was under consideration, Mr. Fillmore observed that he saw nothing in it that was seriously objectionable on his part, except the word "vegetables" being in the list of free articles. He made a note to strike that out as it might interfere with the sale of vegetables in the Buffalo market. And this extraordinary reservation is noted in his own handwriting with red ink, in the original draft preserved in the State Department at Washington. Now, then, with a mind like this at the head of our government, that could see nothing outside of a Buffalo garden patch, or the Buffalo cabbage market, how was the treaty to be negotiated—involving as it did the great interests of reciprocity in trade between the United States and the British North American possessions, embracing an area of millions of square miles, and all the vast and varied interests embraced in it? Of course nothing could be done on a subject so large as the reciprocity treaty, with a mind so small as the President's, and the Secretary of State gave it up in disgust, and left it for his successor to arrange.

Who can support a man for President that predicts and counsels resistance, revolution, or dissolution, if anybody is elected but himself, and who is so grossly ignorant in regard to former Presidents, as to make such an absurd statement as was made by Mr. Fillmore in a speech at Albany, from which I give you the following extract:—"We see a po-

litical party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, selected for the first time from the free States alone. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren will submit?" Why, Mr. Scroggs himself could have posted Mr. Fillmore up about such matters. He might have told him that in 1828 the candidates of the party to which Mr. Fillmore was attached were, for President, John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, and, for Vice-President, Richard Rush, of Pennsylvania. Both gentlemen were citizens of free States. The candidates of the other party were, Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, for President, and John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, for Vice-President. These two were citizens of adjoining Slave States. Both were elected, and both held office eight years.

Mr. Fillmore had been elected the previous year to the Assembly of this State, and I think it may safely be assumed that he adhered to his party in that canvass. Again, in 1836, the candidates of the whig party for President and Vice-President were from Ohio and New-York—two free Northern States. You are aware that he supported Harrison and Granger in 1836. What has Mr. Fillmore seen while travelling abroad that he has become so enamored of, as to have made him forget the history of his own country? Or, has he been holding office all his life, and not taken interest enough in his own country to study its history? Words of admonition come with very little to recommend them from the Buffalo statesman, shrouded in such ignorance, and delivered, too, at the capital of his native State. I would advise him, having returned home, and being out of employment, to apply himself to study, so that he may not again distress his American countrymen, by a public exhibition of such frightful ignorance and heartless selfishness.

In reference to the Americanism of Mr. Fillmore, I will say, that all my knowledge of his being a member of the American order was derived from Mr. Scroggs himself. He stated to me and to others that Mr. Fillmore had never been in a Council, but was made a member in his own house, by deputy Scroggs; that he had never openly identified himself with the American party, so that if two or three persons had chosen to keep it quiet, it would never have been known that he was in any way connected with it, and that was the motive why he kept himself in that equivocal position, so that it could be said he was or he was not a member of the American order, as would best subserve his purposes; and that was the intention at the time and up to the moment when he left for Europe, last summer.

Mr. Scroggs, in his letter, has a great deal to say about the Fugitive Slave Law, and that Mr. Fillmore did not dare to act on his individual objections and veto it, because it was one of the compromise measures.

I have a few words to say about this. The Fugitive Slave Law which Mr. Fillmore signed, deprives a man of his freedom without the right of

trial by jury—a right which he cannot be deprived of without the violation of one of the first principles of a free government; not only this, but it gives the judge a premium or double fee if he finds him a slave, and only one-half of the fee if he finds him a freeman. Is this the law that the constitution contemplated in its provisions for the rendition of fugitives from labor? or is it a tyrannical law, expressly prohibited by the constitution and its safeguards for liberty? when it expressly states "that where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of a trial by jury shall be preserved," so that this Fugitive Slave Law in fact makes the liberty of the citizen of less value than \$20.

Some may say that if this Fugitive Slave Law does injustice, that it is only to the poor wronged enslaved Africans; that humanity has no right to be exercised by the wrongs done them, and therefore, we of the North should cheerfully turn out and put this odious law in force with the same zest that we would hunt wild beasts in the forest—that notwithstanding they are creatures of the same God, and have the same accountability to their Creator, yet we ought not to have any feeling of accountability for our conduct towards them—that we have so long practised this iniquitous tyranny over them, it has become a part of our nature to continue to exercise it—that our feelings of humanity should be buried—that our feelings of responsibility to our Creator should be disregarded—that we must not utter a sentiment in opposition to that tyranny that makes a mother cut the throat of her infant before our eyes, rather than see her offspring returned to bondage.

This same law which applies to the African, is now so to be construed as to apply to Americans, and is now to be visited upon us, and upon our descendants; for the notorious Judge Kane, of Pennsylvania, has recently decided that this fugitive law applies to white apprentices, to boys or girls that are bound out; and that they, too, are to be deprived of their liberty, without the right of a trial by jury; and under this system of giving a premium to the judge for decisions in favor of bondage, white or black, I would ask freemen of the North and South if they have no regard for the African to do him justice; whether they have not some regard left for their own posterity; and whether this law that submits both races to degradation, cannot be repealed or altered without a violation of the constitution or sacrilege to the Union? Can we be made such abject slaves by the bugbear cry of dissolution of the Union by the 350,000 slave-holders of the South, and their sycophants at the North, as to be frightened from the path of duty and justice that our constitution was created to encourage and protect?

The Fugitive Slave Law was passed separately by itself. It came separately before President Fillmore for his consideration, and I would ask, what more sacred duty is there in using the veto than to guard the liberty of the citizen against the enactment of any unjust or tyrannical law?

Mr. Scroggs says that Mr. Fillmore did not approve of all its provisions. If he did not, he should have returned it to Congress with his objections, particularly when the liberty of the citizen was involved. I say that Mr. Fillmore did ap-

prove of all the provisions of this Fugitive Law, and his signature to the bill without any objections, is the best evidence of the fact, and it was his complete subserviency to the 350,000 slave owners that made him sign it.

A great deal has been said of what the 350,000 slave owners of the South will do if they cannot have their own way in everything, by the croakers, both North and South, and a dissolution of the Union is threatened if abject acquiescence to everything that the 350,000 slave-owners demand is not submitted to by the people of the North and South, as though there were no interests and no rights that belong to the people of this country, except those of the 350,000 slave-owners of the South. These few thousand must establish its policy, decide upon its interests, control the general government for their special benefit, or the Union will be dissolved?

My opinion is that the Union will stand much longer upon justice than it will upon injustice, that it will stand longer upon freedom than it will upon slavery, that when the rights of all our citizens, and all our interests are cared for by wise legislation, and a fair administration of our government towards all sections of the country, the Union will command the respect and support of the great majority of our citizens in every section of the Union, and perform the object for which it was created much better, and endure much longer, than it will by subserving the paltry interest of 350,000 slave-owners, and the sycophants of the North, notwithstanding their feeble cry of dissolution, for what are they and their interests compared with the interests of 25,000,000 of freemen, North and South, who do not own slaves? It is upon the great mass of the people that our institutions depend for their safety and permanence, and the policy of our government should commend itself to their interests and to them. They are the power that will take care of the Union, and regulate the policy of our government.

If we must have a Fugitive Slave Law under the Constitution, let us have one that comes within the scope of its provisions, and not, like the present, that is in direct contradiction to the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen.

It is said that this law has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. So will any law that is dictated by the 350,000 slave-owners in relation to slavery, so long the court is constituted, as it now is, by a majority of judges from the 350,000 slave-owners in the Southern States, and such men as Kane and others from the North, who are subservient to the 350,000 slave-owners; for it is well known that no man, however eminent he may be, can now be appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, and be confirmed by the Senate, as now constituted, unless his views upon slavery are perfectly satisfactory to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South. If these judges transgress their duty, and are to be tried, who is to do it but a Senate, the great majority of whose members lend a willing obedience to the 350,000 Southern slave-owners' dictation, and are endeavoring to coerce by violence, the few who represent the great mass of their constituents honestly?

So much for the rights of freemen when committed to the charge of the Executive, the Senate, or the Judiciary, with their present views; for, after the recent outrage in the Senate, its acquiescence in such outrage, the approbation of it by the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, and the trial of the perpetrator of the outrage before a federal judge, who uttered not a word of disapprobation against the offender for violated law in the Senate Chamber, shows clearly how little voice the freemen of the North or South have in the Senate, in the federal courts, or with the Executive, when their interest or rights come in contact with the three hundred and fifty thousand slave-owners. The freemen of the North and South should think of this in the coming Presidential canvass, and cast their votes for John C. Fremont, who stands pledged to do justice to all sections of the country—in opposition to James Buchanan or Millard Fillmore—the northern sycophants of the sectional 350,000 slave-owners of the South.

It is to correct these wrongs, and bring the General Government back to the administration of justice towards all, that the North has united to put down by the ballot box, these wrongs and outrages perpetrated by the extremists of the South.

Mr. Scroggs dilates learnedly about "the Crescent City matter," as he calls it.

In my letter, the Crescent City affair was referred to, as one of the instances in which Mr. Fillmore, as President, not only failed to protect American citizens, American interests, and to vindicate an insult offered to our flag and the nation by a foreign Government through its Minister at Washington, and endeavored to use his influence with the employees of Mr. Smith, an American citizen, to turn him out of the employment and put another in his place, as Purser of the Crescent City, upon the demand of the Captain General of Cuba. There were various other instances during the administration of Mr. Fillmore that came to my knowledge. The records of the department will show facts of the grossest violation of American rights—of insults to our flag, degrading to the nation, all of which cases Mr. Fillmore not only failed to redress, but he yielded a tame obedience to the wrongs.

The steamship Ohio, commanded by Lieutenant Schenck, of the United States Navy, bearing the American flag and carrying the mails of the United States, entered the port of Havana, as usual, with her mails and freights. She was driven from her usual anchorage to a place under the guns of the Moro Castle. Captain Schenck and all persons on board the ship were interdicted from communication with the shore. Captain Schenck's remonstrances were unheeded, but through the intercession of the consignee at Havana, he was at length given permission to land. After being twice insultingly driven back, he landed in his own boat, and was then marched through the streets of Havana, in the uniform of an American naval officer, in the custody of a Spanish subaltern, to the American agency. Captain Schenck protested against the insult offered to his flag, his person, and his ship, and remonstrated against the danger of the loss of his ship,

from the liability in the narrow entrance in which she was confined to be driven upon the rocky shore to which she was exposed. He was insultingly informed that if he did not like his berth he could go to sea as quick as he pleased. This was, of course, impracticable, as the usual supply of coal, which he had not been allowed to take on board, was indispensable to the prosecution of the voyage.

Next was the *Falcon*, commanded by Lieutenant Rogers, of the U. S. Navy, also bearing the flag of the United States, and carrying the United States mails and passengers. She was fired into on the high seas, near the island of Cuba, by a Spanish vessel of war, and was boarded and overhauled in the most insulting manner.

The next instance was the case of the *El Dorado*, Capt. Mitchell, of the United States Navy. This steamer arrived off Havana from Aspinwall, with the United States government mails, 290 passengers, and nearly two millions of treasure. Her usual place of stopping was Havana, to procure coal, water, and supplies. She was met outside the harbor by a pilot, who conveyed to her orders not to enter the port. She was peremptorily driven off under the threat of firing upon her from the fort. Capt. Mitchell had no alternative but to obey, and proceeded to sea, deprived of the necessary supplies for pursuing her voyage. All he could do was to float at sea at the mercy of the elements. As soon as this condition of things was ascertained, the *Empire City* was immediately got ready to follow in search of the *El Dorado*. She found her, and thus saved the lives of her passengers, and the ship and freight from destruction.

Next was the case of the American steamer *Philadelphia*, Captain McGowan, which was one of peculiar hardship and cruelty. She also carried the United States mails and passengers. She entered the port of Havana, her usual place of stopping, for the purpose of obtaining coals, water, provisions, &c.; and having the cholera on board, she was ordered directly into Quarantine, to which place she went. Her supplies of coal and water were brought alongside, and without having time given her to receive them on board, she was immediately ordered, and driven outside of the harbor of Havana. When a mile outside of the Moro Castle, her coals and water were brought alongside the ship. Again she was peremptorily driven off under the threat of being fired into by the guns of the forts if she did not leave at once, without being allowed to receive on board her supplies of water, coal, and provisions, which were indispensably necessary to the safe prosecution of her voyage, and in wanton disregard of the lives of three hundred passengers on board. The appalling scenes of suffering and death which ensued beggars all description. Her voyage was thus broken up. She was obliged to go to an island near Key West, as the nearest land, and there take on shore her passengers, and place them under such shelter as could be put up with the awnings and sails of the steamer, in order to get them out of the ship, where the disease was raging with such violence. Small sailing vessels were procured to send those that were able to

go to Mobile and New Orleans, as the steamer was rendered useless for the want of fuel. As soon as this was heard of in New York, a steamer was immediately got ready and despatched to their relief in less than twenty-four hours, but before she arrived there, one-third of the passengers had died of the disease.

Then followed "the *Crescent City* affair," to which I have already alluded, and which the owners of the vessel vindicated.

These are only a portion of the insults and wrongs to our citizens that took place during the administration of Mr. Fillmore. They were regularly complained of to his government as they occurred. No satisfaction or redress was ever obtained—not only that, but as far as was possible they were kept a secret by our government from the American people.

President Fillmore connived at the turning out of Mr. Smith, at the request of the Captain General of Cuba, who was the author of these insults to American citizens, American interests, American vessels, and the American flag.

In view of these enormous and disgraceful facts, how trifling is the attempt of Mr. Scroggs to make the public believe that I have any "personal" interest in offering "proofs" of Mr. Fillmore's culpable carelessness and total disregard of the rights of American citizens while he was acting President.

If there is any distortion on my part in my letter to Mr. Scroggs, it is that I did not allude to one-tenth of the criminal neglect of American interests of which Mr. Fillmore was guilty while in power; and this Mr. Fillmore is the man (for the first time since about four weeks) who has been bellowing so loudly for "Americans to rule America." I would like to know what kind of Americans are to rule America, and whether the American flag, American citizens, American interests, and American vessels are to be vindicated and upheld, or whether they are to be utterly disregarded, as I have shown they were by Millard Fillmore during his administration?

"An American vessel bearing the American flag must be considered American soil, and protects all on board," said the great Webster. This is what we fought for in 1812, and this is what the American people believe in now. Not that American ships are to be made targets of, their voyages broken up, and their passengers and crews butchered for the amusement and gratification of foreign governments, as Mr. Fillmore allowed and encouraged by his conduct during his administration. This is the same Mr. Fillmore who is now held up for the suffrages of the American people for chief magistrate of the nation—a position which he disgraced by his former conduct. What American's blood will not boil with indignation when he is asked to vote for such a candidate?

Mr. Scroggs, in his letter, has much to say in disparagement of Mr. Fremont. Without any attempt to handle the feeble remarks signed by Mr. Scroggs, I come at once to my view of the whole matter. There are three candidates for the Presidency. I will not now say much more than I have said in reference to the claims of Messrs.

Buchanan and Fillmore—both old party hacks. They and their platforms are both sectional. They have both truckled to the 350,000 slave-owners of the South, and though the chances, judging from their former antecedents, are, that if either one of these two is elected, that (as their friends North promise that they will do) they will kick the Southern sectional platform overboard, betray the South, and go in stronger for Northern purposes—yet I will not trust to either one of them or their friends' promises. The corruptions with which they are tied up, the gangs of old hungry office-seeking leeches with whom they are allied, is quite sufficient to disgust me and every other man that wishes to see the country—the whole country—prosper, and go on in its great career of glory and prosperity. It is true that the most wretched Presidents have not been able to retard its splendid destiny—even a Buchanan or a Fillmore may not be able to do it. But it is not worth while that we should run the risk, when we have a new man that we can elect, and that man, one we know to be separated from the corrupt party cliques and hacks, and is the candidate of the whole people, and will owe his election to them.

Mr. Fremont, if elected, will not pander to the extremists of any section, and this commends him to the support of the whole people.

In electing Mr. Fremont we will show the people of the South that we are willing to bring the country back to the position it was in before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and we say to the Southern citizens, "unite with us in doing so," for it will be a triumph of the great medium conservative principles of the country over the extremists who have pushed the Union into its present dangerous position by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—a compromise nearly half as old as the Constitution itself—a wrong which cannot and will not be submitted to, and if it persisted in then the question will be raised as to slavery in the States as well as slavery in the Territories; for if no compromise can be kept that relates to that institution—if no discussion can be tolerated without violence, and if such violence is to be approved and complimented by the three hundred and fifty thousand slave-owners' power, then the institution itself, confined as it really is to the interests of the three hundred and fifty thousand men, becomes such an evil to the whole country as a disturber of the public quiet, that it must be abolished everywhere.

Now, this has become a question seriously to be considered, both North and South, for if men of extreme views on the subject of slavery are to be elected and controlled by the 350,000 slave owners of the South, and they are to push the institution of slavery all over this country, in violation of all compromises, and regardless of all the feelings that exist upon that subject by more than three-fourths of the population of these States, it will then become a question whether slavery is to exist everywhere throughout this Union, or whether

Freedom shall rise in its majesty, wielded, as it will be, by more than three-fourths of our entire population, and drive slavery from a foothold or an existence under our Government.

These are the issues that will come, if the policy of the 350,000 slave-owners' power prevails and elects Mr. Fillmore or Mr. Buchanan under the guidance, as they are now, of these same 350,000 slaveholders of the South.

A thousand reasons should appeal to the good sense of every American, both North and South, why Fremont should be elected over Buchanan or Fillmore, and as the time for the election approaches, tens of thousands will be added to the Fremont hosts. We shall then be able to elect a President who knows no sections, but who will be the President of the whole people—who will execute the duties of his high office with the same uprightness and regard to duty to the whole country, that Mr. Banks has evinced in the performance of his duty as Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was elected by Northern votes, against the warnings of the Southern members, and their attempts to inflame the minds of their constituents with the idea that the supporters of Mr. Banks were actuated by a desire to do injustice to the South, and that his election would lead to a dissolution of the Union; and their trumpet-tongued sycophants of the Pierce administration at the North sounded the same alarm. The people can now see how little reliance can be placed upon those who deprecated the election of Mr. Banks. How much reliance can be placed on those who selected him, and who persevered until he was elected. No speaker has filled the chair with more ability, has been more disinterested and has given more satisfaction to the House, and to the whole country than this Northern Speaker, elected by Northern votes.

The people of the South can see in this how little they have to fear from any injustice at the hands of the North, and the motive that the North has in resisting the power of the 350,000 slaveholders who are pushing the country to extremes in attempting to divide it into a sectional feeling and an uncompromising hostility to every thing that does not accord with their own extreme views. It is from this sectional feeling that we are endeavoring to save the country by the election of Mr. Fremont, and if we succeed and he should be elected, the South will be satisfied that they have had no just cause of alarm, any more than they had in the election of Mr. Banks.

If the mass of the Southern people understand their true interests they will yet join in and swell the electoral vote of Mr. Fremont, and thus put down all sectional strife by admonishing the extremists in their own section of the country, that they cannot be sustained by the people in opening and renewing sectional disputes as they did by their repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

I am, with great respect,

yours truly,

GEORGE LAW.

LETTER FROM GEORGE LAW ON THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

NEW YORK, July 3, 1856.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th ult. I have carefully reflected upon its contents. In reply, I beg to state to you that I deeply regret no more perfect union has been effected by those whose duty it was to have accomplished that object—to unite the whole elements of opposition to the present corrupt administration, wielded as it is by the extreme slave oligarchy of the South. For the last three years, this same oligarchy has used the entire power and patronage of the General Government to crush out all independent action and honest representation on the part of the North, to purchase up Northern men who were willing to misrepresent their constituents from personal motives, and for promises of favor from the present corrupt administration.

All good men who have the love of their country at heart, both in the North and in the South, should unite cordially in a common effort to destroy the viper that has coiled around the freedom and independence of the American people. Freedom of speech is prohibited in the halls of Congress: bowie-knives and revolvers are worn as daily appendages at the Capitol as a means of assault and defence. The Senate declares itself not only powerless for punishment, but even palsied for protection. Its members look quietly on and see a member stricken down in open day in the Senate chamber, without even the common effort of humanity that would be exercised in a bar-room to save a man prostrated, without an opportunity of defending himself. Thus you see that those who represent their constituents honestly, and by unanswerable arguments, and who cannot be purchased by Executive favor, must be awed into silence by bowie-knives, bludgeons, and revolvers. Such is the scheme of Government inaugurated under the Pierce dynasty, and fostered by the Southern sectional power that supports it. Upon this basis, and into the arms of this power, the nominee of the Cincinnati Convention surrenders himself before the country, without the slightest reservation or individual independence of his own. What has the country to expect if Mr. Buchanan succeeds? Nothing better than what it has experienced under Mr. Pierce, and perhaps something worse. One is an old man without independence of mind, or energy of character, which the country is forewarned of by his declaration, that he is no longer James Buchanan, and has no views or opinions of his own, and is therefore the pliant instrument of the Slave power that nominated him at Cincinnati, and must reflect their views only. It will be well for the American people to remember this when they cast their vote for chief magistrate in November next.

The other came into office, a man in the prime of life, without any such submission or pledges, backed up by almost the unanimous voice of the country in his election, and yet he was not three weeks in office before he surrendered himself to

the same oligarchy that has wielded his power during his administration, as absolutely as if he had no will or mind of his own, and had no responsibility to any section of the Union except to the 350,000 slaveholders of the South, who now control the Executive, the Judiciary, and the Senate. The only voice the Free States have in the Federal Government is in the House of Representatives.

Is it not fair to expect that if Mr. Buchanan should be elected, the evils that the country has experienced for the last three years will go on increasing during his administration until the Northern mind will submit no longer to be cheated, bullied, defied, and deprived of its just rights and fair representations in the Federal Government.

As one of the leading features of the coming administration, slavery is to be forced into Kansas. The rivers, the great highway of the nation through Missouri, a Slave State, are to be closed, as they are at present, to the freemen of the North who desire to emigrate to that territory. Those great thoroughfares which have heretofore been looked upon as the pride of the nation, and that steam has rendered so valuable for the transportation of persons or property, must be closed to the freemen of the North, or they must be subjected to examination, insult, loss of property, and turned back, unless they proclaim themselves in favor of the institution of slavery in this territory. Such means as these are made use of to force slavery into Kansas. When free emigrants arrive there, after all these difficulties and delays have been accumulated, they must undergo another examination, and swear allegiance to the government of the slave power organized in Kansas by the Missouri mob, or be deprived of the right of franchise and of holding office. This is the operation of squatter sovereignty, which deprives a man of his citizenship, unless he swears fidelity to slavery; and all this is to be carried out and put in execution by an armed force, furnished from Missouri—the adjoining Slave State; and the Federal Government, with Federal troops in the Territory, will look on calmly without interfering, so long as the Missouri mob succeeds to enforce slavery upon Kansas; but if the men from the Free States, who believe in free speech, free territory, free labor, free press, and free men, should be too numerous for the slave labor, then the Federal troops organized for this special purpose, under the command of a Southern favorite of a Southern secessionist Secretary of War, are to interfere and decide the contest in favor of Slavery in Kansas. So much for the chances of Northern principles and Northern men in Kansas, and all that vast territory North of 36° 30', secured to freedom by solemn compact, in which the great minds of the country united to build up and preserve to freedom, and which the pigmies and traitors, aided by this corrupt administration, have attempted to pull down and destroy. Here is where Gen. Pierce stands, and here is where

James Buchanan stands, while asking for the support of the freemen of the North.

A few words about Mr. Fillmore. Let us examine with what consistency we, as Americans, or Northern freemen, can support him. What are his antecedents? When President of the United States, was he not entirely subservient to the Slave Power? Did he resist the overtures of the Slave Oligarchy of the South, or did he become a willing instrument in their hands? I ask you to look at his acts while President, and let them be the answers to these questions. I will refer you to the Fugitive Slave Law, that makes the freemen of the North slave catchers—that refuses to them the right of trial by jury—that centres the right of freedom of the man in one judge, and pays him a double fee if he declares him a slave, and only half the fee if he finds him a freeman. This is the power that the slave oligarchy of the South exercise at the North, where we have prohibited property in men to our own citizens; and this act bears the signature of Millard Fillmore as President of the United States. I ask you how he can expect the vote of the free North. Can you give him your vote? Can I give him mine? Are these the views you and I entertain in relation to the rights and the duty of the people of the North or mankind? Now, sir, upon this question alone, without going into all his other acts of subserviency to the South and the slave power, let him stand for the suffrages of the freemen of the North.

As to the Americanism of Mr. Fillmore, you and I have some knowledge of how much he has done to sustain that party. Has he ever been identified with it either in principle or in feeling? If so, where are his acts—on what occasion heretofore has he proclaimed it? What assistance has he ever rendered us in all our contests? What were his antecedents to Americanism when President of the United States? Did he then protect American interests or American men? I well recollect that he did not, and the country will recollect it too.

When the Captain-General of Cuba issued his decree prohibiting the steamship Crescent City from touching at Havana so long as Mr. Smith, an American citizen, was aboard of her as Purser, because, as they alleged, the *Herald* and other papers in New York had published some information from Havana that was distasteful to the Cuban Government, and which they charged to have been furnished by Purser Smith, and, therefore, neither the Crescent City nor any other American ship should be allowed to touch at Havana having Mr. Smith on board, or any other person who would dare to furnish to the American press information disagreeable to the Captain-General of Cuba—Mr. Fillmore was apprised of this order by the owners of the Crescent City, and he was desired to take some action in relation to it for protection of American property and American citizens; he miserably skulked the responsibility of his position, and used his interest with the owners to have Mr. Smith dismissed as purser, and to be replaced by some one who was satisfactory to the Captain-General of Cuba.

This the owners refused to do, and sent Mr.

Smith back in the ship. Mr. Fillmore ordered the United States mails to be taken from the vessel, and notified the owners that if the ship was fired upon by the Cuban authorities, and damaged or destroyed, that they would have no claim upon this Government for remuneration. The commander of the Crescent City was removed by his order, he being an officer of the United States Navy, and under the President's control. Another commander was appointed by the owners. He, too, was removed by Mr. Fillmore's orders. The ship was fined \$4,000 for not carrying the United States mails, when the United States Government or Mr. Fillmore withheld them. The insurance offices in New-York were either frightened by the course of Mr. Fillmore, or influenced by him to withhold their insurance from property shipped by the steamer that Purser Smith was on board of. The owners of the Crescent City had to insure the property of the shippers. The passengers on board of her were not allowed to be landed in Cuba. The owners persevered in what they considered their proper rights, and the rights of an American citizen, and refused to dismiss Purser Smith, until the Captain-General of Cuba was obliged to rescind the mandate against Purser Smith. This is the mode in which the rights of an American citizen had to be vindicated while Mr. Fillmore was President. This is the same Mr. Fillmore that you recommend me to support as an American. Now, sir, can you support him as an American? Can the American Party support him as an American? Is he the proper representative of the American people? These are facts for the American people to look at before they vote. For my part, Mr. Fillmore would be the last man I would support in the whole country as the standard bearer of the great American Party.

What has Mr. Fillmore ever done for this country or the American Party? Where are his acts that are to be remembered or treasured up in the hearts of the people? What great interests has he ever advanced? Or has he been a mere office-holder, without merit, except the merit of doing nothing?

You are aware of the manner in which he was forced upon the American party by the Slave Oligarchy at Philadelphia, when he apparently received the nomination of the Convention.

In the letter to me you appear to lay great stress upon the course that the Republican party has seen fit to pursue, and that it has not met the American party half way in the great work of uniting the whole North against the corrupt policy of the present Administration and the power that controls the Cincinnati nominee. We will suppose that all this is true in relation to the Republican party. I myself do not think the Republican Convention acted as wisely as it might have done, when the object was harmony of action to accomplish a great good for the whole country; but is this any reason why I should be diverted from the great purpose I have at heart, which is to unite all parties that think as I do in relation to the corrupt policy of the present Administration, and the continuation of that policy if Mr. Buchanan should be elected? No man, or set of men, whatever their conduct may be, shall divert me for one

moment from the course I have marked out in the coming Presidential campaign.

I intend to go for the man who most nearly represents the American sentiment, and the sentiment in relation to Slavery of the freemen of the North, which declares that Slavery is sectional and that Freedom is national. At the same time I desire to have the best representative of the progress of the age in which we live. I want a man who has done something for the great material interests of the country. I want to see his footprints, not promised, but already made in the direction that has led to the development of the resources of our country—who has enlarged the field upon which the labor and intelligence of our country is to be applied—one who has done something for American interests and American rights—one who has done something for the area of freedom—something for material progress and benefit to his fellow men. I want no old politician, with his host of dependents as seedy as himself. Let us have a man in the prime of life, full of energy, and yet sufficiently familiar with the vicissitudes of life to judge of men correctly—to appreciate the wants of the whole country—to avoid the intrigues and traps of politicians—to devote himself honestly and fearlessly to the interests of the country—to apply the resources of the Government to the accomplishment of such improvements as are national in their character, and that will result in the greatest benefit to the whole country—one who has no old political friends to reward, and no old political enemies to punish—one who will feel that he is elevated by the people and not by intrigue. Now, Sir, of the candidates who are before the people for the exalted position of Chief Magistrate, I prefer JOHN C. FREMONT. I prefer him because he is not an old hackneyed politician, and all sold out. He is in the prime of life—43 years old. He has been brought into notice by the energy and exertion that he has evinced as a great explorer of the route to the Pacific Ocean. He first opened up the pathway through the wilderness that others followed to the golden fields of California, and gave the most accurate and extended view to the American people, of all that vast region of country between the borders of civilization on the Atlantic slope and the Pacific Ocean. He took an active part and was foremost in raising and sustaining the American flag in California. He commenced first and went all through the campaign with signal success, that ended in the acquisition of all that vast territory and wealth—that opened up to American enterprise and American energy such a field as has no parallel in history—which has advanced the country at least 25 years at a single bound. It gave us the facilities of increasing our commerce. It enabled us to extend largely our railways and other internal improvements, and thus has greatly increased our manufacturing and agri-

cultural interests by enlarging the field of produce and consumption. It has added hundreds of millions to the capital of the nation. By his explorations he has opened up the most central and convenient railroad route to California. He aided in the organization of California as a State, and devoted her institutions to freedom, and she acknowledged her indebtedness to Fremont, by sending him as her first Senator to Congress. He protected American interests in California. He protected and advocated American interests in the Senate of the United States. His antecedents are American. He rose by his own energy, his own industry, and his own merit. These are antecedents that will be appreciated by the American people. They are not the promises of today of American principles under the expectation of the suffrages of the American party, but they are a history of his life from his youth upward, when actuated by no other motives than a true American heart, thoroughly devoted to the interests of his country.

With this view of the subject, who are we to support? I have fairly canvassed the different candidates. So far as Americanism is concerned, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan as Mr. Fillmore. He has a fairer American record than Mr. Fillmore; and, as for the promises of old politicians, we all know what they are worth on the eve of an election. I do not mean to be cheated by them, nor do I wish to see the American people, by pretensions that have no value, but that are entirely worthless.

In relation to the subject of the extension of Slavery, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan as Mr. Fillmore. Mr. Buchanan promises that he will be governed by the Southern slaveholders, and Mr. Fillmore we know has already been governed by them.

As to advancing the interests of the country, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan, as Mr. Fillmore. Neither of them has ever advanced, by any act of his own, the great industrial interests of the country. They have both been drones, living on office. The only difference that I see is, that Mr. Fillmore is about five years younger than Mr. Buchanan, and has that many chances less to die.

You would laugh and ridicule the idea if I were to ask you to vote for Mr. Buchanan as a proper representative of the American party; it seems to me equally ridiculous that you should ask me to vote for Mr. Fillmore as the American Candidate.

I shall give my support to John C. Fremont, as the best representative, in my estimation, of the American people and the American party.

I am, with much respect, yours truly,

GEORGE LAW.

To G. A. SCHOOLS, Esq., Buffalo, N. Y.

CHAUNCEY SHAFFER, ESQ., RENOUNCING FILLMORE.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, August 14, 1856.

W. DUNN, Esq.—*My Dear Sir:*

I have just received, by way of New-York city, your note of the 9th inst., enclosing the following extract from the Ithaca Citizen, to wit:

"COMING BACK.—Chauncey Shaffer, who was one of the most prominent bolters from the Philadelphia American Convention, and who has been stumping the river counties in this State at the Fremont meetings, has returned to the hearty support of Fillmore and Donelson. Mr. Shaffer is an eloquent speaker, and was District Attorney in New York city. He belongs to the Methodist church, and his recent conviction that Mr. Fremont is a Roman Catholic, is the reason why he withdraws his support from the Republicans. He has candidly examined all the evidences for and against, which have appeared, and he looked closely into the statements of Fulmer, and the opposition against them, and declares that the evidence in favor of his being a Papist is conclusive, for which reason he cannot support him."

You assure me that the above is producing an impression in your region, and desire me to inform you whether it is true or not. I answer that it is a sheer fabrication—a "Roorback." That no further mischief may occur from the circulation of that article, I will set the matter of my preference of candidates right at once.

In the first place, I was not a prominent or other "bolter from the Philadelphia American Convention." I was not a delegate to that Convention. There were reasons why I should not be a delegate. I had too much to do with undoing the work of a previous Council in Philadelphia assembled; too much to do against the slave propagandists at Binghamton last August, and was too little inclined to see Americanism sold out, to be considered a safe man to go to Philadelphia.

I staid at home against my will, I admit. Moreover, that Convention was not an "American Convention."

As far as the North was concerned, it was a Silver Grey Whig Convention; as far as the South was concerned, it was a Convention for the propagation of human slavery, and the result was the nomination of two men, one of whom glories in being the owner of a hundred slaves, and the other (Mr. Fillmore), in being a most subservient instrument of the slave power, as is manifestly proved by his course while acting as President of the United States; also, by his speeches made during his southern tour, in pursuit of a re-nomination, as well as by his nullification speeches at Albany and elsewhere, on his return from his visit to the Pope.

Hence the leading Silver Grey newspapers of the North (including the New York Express), claim Mr. Fillmore as the regular Whig nominee for the Presidency, while the South claim him as the champion of Southern rights (meaning the ex-

tension of human slavery by the action of the General Government), while Mr. Fillmore, to justify the claims of the South, in effect says, "Elect me, or the South, that loves me so well, shall not remain in the Union."

As an American, I am not bound by the action of that Convention; rather let me say, I cannot submit to be bound by its action, any more than can my brethren of Massachusetts or Connecticut, and of every New England State. The American party of Massachusetts, in solemn council assembled, has declared for Mr. Fremont, and nominated electors favorable to his election: and so has the State of Connecticut, and so will all New England do (for New England has a history), and so will the American party of this State act, excepting always a portion of the Silver Grey portion of that party. The latter portion will stand by Mr. Fillmore, notwithstanding he "has adopted the leading principles of that platform," the seventh section of which commits the American party to Slavery extension under the guise of squatter sovereignty; because this "portion of a portion" came into the order with the design of retrieving the fallen fortunes of Mr. Fillmore, as is proved by the attempted ostracism of the liberal-minded men of the order, and by the threats preceding and accompanying the Philadelphia Convention, that in the event of George Law's receiving the nomination for the Presidency, they with the Whig party proper, would nominate an out-and-out American Whig (meaning Mr. Fillmore, I presume), and also by letters now in existence, and which, I hope, will yet be published.

I have not "returned to the hearty support of Fillmore and Donelson," nor will I do any act or thing tending to sanction the outrages of proslavery, nullification border ruffians, who, in addition to their outrages in Missouri and Kansas, of themselves sufficient to turn the cheek of darkness pale, have from 1852 until now, wrested the high powers of the nation from their legitimate purpose, to the strengthening of the slave oligarchy.

There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, founded upon the fact stated by the Citizen, that I belong to the Methodist Church.

The church owes slavery no particular good will; for slavery has rent that church in twain; has imprisoned women for teaching slaves to read the Bible, and has sought in every way to destroy that church, as being the opponent of slavery most to be feared. Let facts speak. Last winter a minister of the Methodist Church, in Missouri, was arrested while in the pulpit by a gang of men (who, if they live, will probably vote for Mr. Fillmore), who wantonly and falsely charged him with horse-stealing, and without allowing him time to put on his overcoat, mounted him on a horse, drove him some seventeen miles, (the weather being intensely cold,) threw him into a cheerless room, without fire, and there left him to die, and there he died.

My informant is a bishop of the Methodist Church, and spoke of his own knowledge.

Another instance: The Rev. Mr. Wiley, and about 30 other ministers of the Methodist Church, have been assailed in their churches, and driven from place to place like wild beasts of prey, their lives being every day in imminent peril.

Another instance: In Kansas, a Methodist minister was whipped, tarred, and feathered, tied to a log, and set afloat on the Missouri river.

Another instance: Very recently, a Methodist minister in Missouri, while preaching was dragged from his pulpit and tarred and feathered; while an old Methodist layman for the crime of expostulation against such conduct, was shot; and it is a notorious fact, and one which will not admit of controversy, that a minister of my church cannot preach the gospel in the State of Missouri, or the Territory of Kansas, but at the peril of his life! And yet I find no reproof of these outrages either in the Philadelphia platform, or in any of the speeches of Mr. Fillmore.

As to my having examined "all the evidence" in relation to Mr. Fremont's religious creed, I have to say that I have examined all the evidence including Alderman Fulmer's statement, and have exhausted the means of information within my reach, and have arrived at the following conclusions:

1st. That Mr. Fremont's father was a French Huguenot, and his mother an American Protestant lady.

2d. That Col. Fremont was born a Protestant, and baptized a Protestant, married a Protestant lady, has had his children baptized by a Protestant clergyman, educates them in the Protestant faith, while he is a Protestant in practice in all the relations of life.

I admit that he was married by a Catholic clergyman, under circumstances peculiar to himself, and with which the public is already acquainted.

3d. I conclude that Alderman Fulmer's statement is altogether untrue. Col. Fremont was not in Washington at the time Fulmer says he conversed with him, nor within several months of that time. He was on the Pacific Ocean, or the Isthmus of Darien, or on the steamer George Law from Aspinwall to New York city, at the time fixed by Fulmer.

I should add that upon Col. Fremont's arrival in New-York city, he sailed to Europe without visiting Washington at all, and that he remained in Europe more than a year.

I should further add, that the conviction in my mind that Alderman Fulmer has borne false witness against his neighbor, is strengthened by the contradictory statements that I am positively informed he has made concerning this pretended conversation, and by the further facts that amongst his immediate neighbors his statement is not believed.

But if I should refuse to vote for Mr. Fremont, because of his being a Roman Catholic, I could not vote for Mr. Fillmore; and for the reason that the Convention which nominated Mr. Fillmore was controlled by Roman Catholics as well as by slavery propagandists. This is the proof:

Two sets of delegates, appeared from the State of Louisiana, one Protestant, and the other Roman Catholic, both demanding admission. The Roman Catholic delegation was received, and the Protestant delegation was rejected. The reason, I understand, assigned for this singular admission and rejection was, that the Roman Catholic delegation did not acknowledge the temporal supremacy of the Pope—but did the Protestant delegation acknowledge the temporal supremacy of the Pope?

There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, and as an American, and a man who at the commencement of his political life resolutely set his face against the further aggressions of the slave power, I cannot be induced by any special pleading or by any "Roorbaeks" that may be hatched in the hotbed of political zeal, to vote for any other man for President than Col. Fremont, inasmuch as I see no other way of putting an end to the terrible aggressions of the slave power.

I believe upon the election or defeat of Col. Fremont, will depend the questions, whether or not the black column of slavery will be pushed to the Pacific ocean; whether or not the African slave trade, the sum of all wickedness, will be revived; and whether or not practical slavery shall be forced upon the Free States under the decisions of Federal judges, appointed as Mr. Fillmore sought to appoint and did appoint some of his judges; and in short, whether this country shall have a constitutional government for the whole country, or an unconstitutional government for the slave oligarchy; whether or not we shall recover our lost national honor, and go on in peaceful progress to the climax of human greatness; whether we shall be destroyed by the aggressive system of the slave power.

Very truly yours,

CHAUNCEY SHAFFER.